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What is AN voice?

- What is AN voice/focus system?
- Typologically highly unusual morphosyntactic category
- Descriptive facts quite straightforward
What is AN voice?

- One argument in a clause has a special, “pivotal” role.
- Depending on the semantic role of that argument, this special role is overtly marked on the verb.
  
  (Chung and Polinsky 2009; Blust 2013)

- The special argument bears properties of a subject:
  - Surfaces in subject position
  - Can be marked with nominative case
  - Can be extracted under subject-only restriction
Philippine-type voice system

- A typical Philippine-type voice system has four voices:
  - ACTIVE VOICE
  - PASSIVE VOICE
  - LOCATIVE VOICE
  - INSTRUMENTAL VOICE
Examples

(1) a. \textit{b-um-ilí naŋ kotse aŋ lalake}  
\text{buy-AV GEN car NOM man}  
\text{“The man bought a car.”}  

b. \textit{b-in-ilí naŋ lalake aŋ Kotse}  
\text{buy-PV.PF GEN man NOM car}  
\text{“A man bought the car.”}
Examples

(1) a.  \textit{b-um-ilí naŋ kotse aŋ lalake}
\begin{align*}
\text{buy-AV GEN car} & \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{man} \\
\text{“The man bought a car.”}
\end{align*}

b.  \textit{b-in-ilí naŋ lalake aŋ kotse}
\begin{align*}
\text{buy-PV.PF GEN man} & \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{car} \\
\text{“A man bought the car.”}
\end{align*}
Examples

(1) a.  
\[b\text{-}um\text{-}i\text{l}i \ n\vec{a}n \ k\vec{ot}se \ a\vec{n} \ lalak\vec{e}\]
buy-AV GEN car NOM man
“The man bought a car.”

b.  
\[b\text{-}in\text{-}i\text{l}i \ n\vec{a}n \ lalak\vec{e} \ a\vec{n} \ k\vec{ot}se\]
buy-PV.PF GEN man NOM car
“A man bought the car.”
Examples

(2) a.  

\textit{b-in-i-bilh-án naŋ laláke naŋ isdáŋ aŋ báta?}  

RED-PERF-buy-LV GEN man GEN fish NOM child  

“A man is buying fish from the child.”
Examples

(2) a.  *b-in-i-bilh-án*  
   *naŋ laláke naŋ isdá? aŋ báta?*  

RED-PERF-buy-LV GEN man GEN fish NOM child  
“A man is buying fish from the child.”
Examples

(2) a. \textit{b-in-i-bilh-án naŋ laláke naŋ isdá? aŋ báta?} \\
RED-PERF-buy-LV GEN man GEN fish NOM child \\
“A man is buying fish from the child.”

b. \textit{i-b-in-ilí naŋ laláke naŋ isdá? aŋ báta?} \\
BV-PERF-buy GEN man GEN fish NOM child \\
“A man bought some fish for the child.”
Examples

(2) a. \( b\text{-}in\text{-}i\text{-}bilh\text{-}án \quad naŋ \ laláke naŋ \ isdí? \ aŋ \ báta? \)
RED-PERF-buy-LV GEN man GEN fish NOM child
“A man is buying fish from the child.”

b. \( i\text{-}b\text{-}in\text{-}ilí \quad naŋ \ laláke naŋ \ isdí? \ aŋ \ báta? \)
BV-PERF-buy GEN man GEN fish NOM child
“A man bought some fish for the child.”
Examples

(2) a. \[ b-in-i-bilh-\acute{a}n \quad na\j\ \text{al\acute{a}ke} \quad na\j\ \text{isd\acute{a}}? \quad a\j\ \text{b\acute{a}ta}? \]
   RED-PERF-buy-LV GEN man \quad GEN fish \quad NOM child
   “A man is buying fish from the child.”

b. \[ i-b-in-il\acute{i} \quad na\j\ \text{al\acute{a}ke} \quad na\j\ \text{isd\acute{a}}? \quad a\j\ \text{b\acute{a}ta}? \]
   BV-PERF-buy GEN man \quad GEN fish \quad NOM child
   “A man bought some fish for the child.”

c. \[ (i-)p-in-am-bil\acute{i} \quad na\j\ \text{lalake} \quad na\j\ \text{isd\acute{a}}? \quad a\j\ \text{pera}? \]
   IV-PERF-buy \quad GEN man \quad GEN fish \quad NOM money
   “A man bought some fish with the money.”
Examples

(2)  a.  \( b-in-i-bilh-án \) \( naŋ \) \( laláke \) \( naŋ \) \( isdí̱k \) \( aŋ \) \( báta? \)
RED-PERF-buy-LV GEN man GEN fish NOM child
“A man is buying fish from the child.”

b.  \( i-b-in-ilí \) \( naŋ \) \( laláke \) \( naŋ \) \( isdí̱k \) \( aŋ \) \( báta? \)
BV-PERF-buy GEN man GEN fish NOM child
“A man bought some fish for the child.”

c.  \( (i-)p-in-am-bilí \) \( naŋ \) \( lalake \) \( naŋ \) \( isdí̱k \) \( aŋ \) \( pera? \)
IV-PERF-buy GEN man GEN fish NOM money
“A man bought some fish with the money.”
Examples

(2)  a.  \( b{-}i{-}b_{1}l-h{-}an \) naŋ laláke naŋ isdá? aŋ báta?
    RED-PERF-buy-LV GEN man GEN fish NOM child
    “A man is buying fish from the child.”

    b.  \( i{-}b{-}i{-}n-ilí \) naŋ laláke naŋ isdá? aŋ báta?
    BV-PERF-buy GEN man GEN fish NOM child
    “A man bought some fish for the child.”

    c.  \( (i{-})p{-}i{-}n-am-bilí \) naŋ lalake naŋ isdá? aŋ pera?
    IV-PERF-buy GEN man GEN fish NOM money
    “A man bought some fish with the money.”
Theoretical accounts

- **Heterogeneous** theoretical analyses
- Focus marking, case marking, or simply agreement marking between the “special” subject and the verb?
- Almost no consensus on synchronic analysis
Historical accounts

- Even less consensus on the history of such a system
- Wolff’s 1973 reconstruction
- Two proposals:
  - Nominalization hypothesis
  - Voice-first hypothesis
Goals of the paper

- How did this typologically unusual system develop?
- What morphosyntactic processes led to AN voice system?
Broader implications

- How far can internal reconstruction get us?
- Methodological consideration
- How can diachronic syntax inform theoretical syntax?
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**Voice system of Austronesian and its origins**
PAN voice system

- Wolff 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>*-um-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>*-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>*-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>*(S)i-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Crucial observation, so far neglected in the literature: voice affixes have **other functions**

- **Voice** and **Nominalizing** functions,
PAN voice system

- Wolff 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>*-um-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>*-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>*-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>*(S)i-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Crucial observation, so far neglected in the literature: voice affixes have **other functions**
- **Voice** and **Nominalizing** functions, but not limited to these functions
Active voice: *-um-

- No nominalizing function
- Almost always intransitive
  *k-um-aen ‘to eat’ from *kaen ‘eating’ or *C-um-aŋis ‘weep, cry’ from *Caŋis ‘weeping, crying’

**Inchoative** function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bontok</td>
<td>bīkas</td>
<td>‘energetic’</td>
<td>b-um-īkas</td>
<td>‘becoming energetic’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>sakít</td>
<td>‘pain’</td>
<td>s-um-akít</td>
<td>‘become painful’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tindal Dusun</td>
<td>gayo</td>
<td>‘big’</td>
<td>g-um-ayo</td>
<td>‘become big’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukah</td>
<td>gadu</td>
<td>‘green’</td>
<td>m-gadu</td>
<td>‘become green’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active voice: *-um-

- No nominalizing function
- Almost always intransitive
  - *k-um-aen ‘to eat’ from *kaen ‘eating’ or *C-um-aŋis ‘weep, cry’ from *Caŋis ‘weeping, crying’
- **Inchoative** function

  Bontok  | bíkas  | ‘energetic’  | b-um-íkas  | ‘becoming energetic’
  Tagalog | sakít  | ‘pain’       | s-um-akít   | ‘become painful’
  Tindal Dusun | gayo  | ‘big’        | g-um-ayo   | ‘become big’
  Mukah   | gadu   | ‘green’      | m-gadu     | ‘become green’
Active voice: *-um-

- No nominalizing function
- Almost always intransitive
  
  *k-um-aen ‘to eat’ from *kaen ‘eating’ or *C-um-añis ‘weep, cry’ from *Cañis ‘weeping, crying’

- Inchoative function

  Bontok  bíkas ‘energetic’  b-um-íkas ‘becoming energetic’
  Tagalog  sakít ‘pain’  s-um-akít ‘become painful’
  Tindal Dusun  gayo ‘big’  g-um-ayo ‘become big’
  Mukah  gadu ‘green’  m-gadu ‘become green’
Passive voice: *-en

- Voice affix
- Nominalization
- *kan-in* ‘be eaten’ and ‘food’ (Blust 2013:395)
Proto-Austronesian

Locative voice: *-an

- Voice affix
- Nominalization

títis ‘cigar or cigarette ash’ vs. titis-án ‘ash tray’ or hábí ‘texture, woven pattern on fabric’ vs. habih-án ‘loom’ (Blust 2013:395)
Locative voice: *-an

- Voice affix
- Nominalization

\textit{tísis} ‘cigar or cigarette ash’ vs. \textit{titis-án} ‘ash tray’ or \textit{hábi} ‘texture, woven pattern on fabric’ vs. \textit{habih-án} ‘loom’ (Blust 2013:395)
Locative voice: *-an

- Voice affix
- Nominalization

títs ‘cigar or cigarette ash’ vs. titis-án ‘ash tray’ or hábi ‘texture, woven pattern on fabric’ vs. habih-án ‘loom’ (Blust 2013:395)
Instrumental voice: *$(S)i$-

- Historically the most opaque
- *$(S)i$-, *$(S)a$-
- Voice affix
- Nominalizer
  
  Fijian *sele-va* ‘to cut’ vs. *i-sele* ‘knife’

Blust (2013:381)
Instrumental voice: *(S)i-

- Historically the most opaque
- *(S)i- , *(S)a-
- Voice affix
- Nominalizer
  
  Fijian *sele-va* ‘to cut’ vs. *i-sele* ‘knife’  
  
  Blust (2013:381)
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Voice system of Austronesian and its origins
Previous Accounts

- Two opposing hypotheses
- Affixes have both nominalizing and voice function
- Voice $\rightarrow$ nominalizing
- Nominalizing $\rightarrow$ voice
Voice hypothesis

- Development of nominalizing affixes from voice morphemes unusual
- Dahl 1973, but no models, no explanations
- “Only a broad comparative study can be decisive”
- Unprecedented
Nominalizing hypothesis

- Starosta et al. (1981, 1982)
- Main arguments:
  - (a) the affixes show the nominalizing function across Austronesian languages, indicating that this function was original;
Nominalizing hypothesis

- Starosta et al. (1981, 1982)
- Main arguments:
  (a) the affixes show the nominalizing function across Austronesian languages, indicating that this function was original;
  (b) the marker for genitive case and by-phrase are the same;
Nominalizing hypothesis

- Starosta et al. (1981, 1982)
- Main arguments:
  (a) the affixes show the nominalizing function across Austronesian languages, indicating that this function was original;
  (b) the marker for genitive case and by-phrase are the same;
  (c) the affixes can surface as prefixes, suffixes, and infixes, pointing to the fact that they had different origins
Nominalizing hypothesis

- Starosta et al. (1981, 1982)
- Main arguments:
  a. the affixes show the nominalizing function across Austronesian languages, indicating that this function was original;
  b. the marker for genitive case and by-phrase are the same;
  c. the affixes can surface as prefixes, suffixes, and infixes, pointing to the fact that they had different origins
  d. the fact that the alternative explanation fails to explain persuasively why and how the nominalizing function could have developed from the voice system
Nominalizing hypothesis — problems

- Voice function also attested across the languages
- *By*-phrases are cross-linguistically “most usually an instrumental, locative, or genitive.”

(3)  

a. *To je avto od mojega strica.*  
   this is car of my uncle  
   “This is my uncle’s car.”

b. *Grozdje je bilo pobrano od nas.*  
grapes was picked by us  
   “The grapes were picked by us.”
Nominalizing hypothesis — problems

- Voice function also attested across the languages
- *By*-phrases are cross-linguistically “most usually an instrumental, locative, or genitive.”

(3) a. *To je avto od mojega strica.*
   this is car of my uncle
   “This is my uncle’s car.”

b. *Grozdje je bilo pobrano od nas.*
   grapes was picked by us
   “The grapes were picked by us.”
Outline
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   - General on voice system
   - Goals of the paper

2 The data
   - Proto-Austronesian

3 Previous accounts
   - Voice hypothesis
   - Nominalizing hypothesis

4 A New Proposal
   - Active voice
   - Other voices

5 Synchronic analysis
   - Syntactic Stages
   - Applicatives

6 Conclusion
A New Proposal

- The proto-language had both functions
- Voice **and** nominalization markers
- Both attested in the languages
A New Proposal

- Reconstruction: one step further
- Pay close attention to all attested functions of the affixes
- Consider grammaticalization theory, internal reconstruction
Active voice

*-um-

Functions:

(a) active voice marking
(b) intransitivity marking
(c) inchoative marking
*-um-

- **Functions:**
  1. active voice marking
  2. intransitivity marking
  3. inchoative marking

- What is the most likely origin?
Active voice

*–um–

- Functions:
  (a) active voice marking
  (b) intransitivity marking
  (c) inchoative marking

- What is the most likely origin?
*-um-

**Reflexive marker**

- Reflexives frequently develop an inchoative-marking function
- French, Spanish, Polish, Bulgarian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Czech, Slovenian, Macedonian and Slovak (Rivero and Milojević Sheppard 2003: 100; Déchaïne and Wiltschko 2012:14)

(4)  
   a. *La porte s’est ouverte.*  
       the door REFL is open.FEM  
       “The door opened”  
   b. *El vaso se rompió.*  
       The vase REFL broke  
       “The vase broke.”  
   c. *Szklanka się rozbiła.*  
       Glass REFL broke  
       “The glass broke.”
*-um-

**Reflexive marker**

- Reflexives frequently develop an inchoative-marking function
- French, Spanish, Polish, Bulgarian, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Czech, Slovenian, Macedonian and Slovak (Rivero and Milojević Sheppard 2003: 100; Déchaïne and Wiltschko 2012:14)

\[(4) \quad \text{a. } \textit{La porte s' est ouverte.} \\
\text{the door REFL is open.FEM} \\
\text{“The door opened”} \\
\text{b. } \textit{El vaso se rompió.} \\
\text{The vase REFL broke} \\
\text{“The vase broke.”} \\
\text{c. } \textit{Szklanka się rozbiła.} \\
\text{Glass REFL broke} \\
\text{“The glass broke.”} \]
In Salishan Halkomelem, -θət marks both reflexives and inchoatives (Gerdts 1998)

{laləm-θət ‘look after self’; əti-θət ‘get big’}
*-um-

In Salishan Halkomelem, -θət marks both reflexives and inchoatives (Gerdts 1998)

laləm-θət ‘look after self’; θi-θát ‘get big’
Active voice

* -um -

- reflexive $\rightarrow$ intransitive marking just as straightforward
- Reflexives remove an internal argument
- This valency-decreasing function can be reanalyzed as primary
- Aranda reflexive marker -lhe develops into the intransitivizer -lhe (Heine and Kuteva 2002:252)
- This proposal explains two of this morpheme’s functions: intransitivity and inchoative marking
Active voice

-um-

- reflexive $\rightarrow$ intransitive marking just as straightforward
- Reflexives remove an internal argument
- This valency-decreasing function can be reanalyzed as primary
- Aranda reflexive marker -lhe develops into the intransitivizer -lhe (Heine and Kuteva 2002:252)
- This proposal explains two of this morpheme’s functions: intransitivity and inchoative marking
Active voice

*'-um-

- How do we get to **active voice marking**?
- *'-um-' simply functioned as an intransitivity marker. When the elaborate voice system with passive, instrumental, and locative voice arose (through the process described below), this intransitivity marker simply **continued to surface** on (intransitive) verbs
- Reanalysis as active voice marker, under the pressure of other affixes
*-um-: Summary

(5)

REFLEXIVE

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{intransitive} & \quad \text{inchoative} \\
-um- & \quad -um- \\
| & \\
\text{voice marker} & \\
-um- & 
\end{align*}
\]
### Other Voices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>*-um-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>*-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td>*-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>*(S)i-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Different origin: nominalizing function absent for *-um-.
- All three in common: **voice marking and nominalizing** functions.
Other Voices

- Proposal: voice and nominalizing affixes go back to prepositions
- Both functions derivable from prepositions
Other Voices

- Prepositions > nominalizers
- Inter-stage with compounds
Other Voices

- Prepositions $\Rightarrow$ nominalizers
- Inter-stage with compounds
Other Voices

- **Prepositions** > nominalizers
- Inter-stage with **compounds**
- *‘having X Y’*
  Tagalog *títis* ‘cigarette ash’ → *titis-án* *‘having ash in’* → ‘ash tray’
- More reasons for why the affixes likely go back to prepositions: Kaufman (forthcoming)
Other Voices

- **Prepositions** \(\succ\) **nominalizers**
- Inter-stage with **compounds**
- \*‘having X Y’
  
  Tagalog *títis* ‘cigarette ash’ → *titis-án* \*‘having ash in’ → ‘ash tray’
- More reasons for why the affixes likely go back to prepositions: Kaufman (forthcoming)
Other Voices

- How do we explain the development to voice system?
- Broader morphosyntactic properties
- My proposal: reanalysis
Other Voices

(6) VERB en-DIR.OBJ an-LOC (S)i-INSTR SUBJ

- Today’s Tondano and Saisiyat
- Evidence that PAN did not mark nominatives
- To mark semantic prominence: Preposition $\rightarrow$ preverb
- The semantics of the preposition get incorporated into the verbal semantics and the corresponding argument or adjunct becomes semantically prominent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other voices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other Voices

(6) VERB *en*-DIR.OBJ  *an*-LOC  *(S)i*-INSTR  SUBJ

- Today’s Tondano and Saisiyat
- Evidence that PAN did not mark nominatives
- To mark semantic prominence: **Preposition → preverb**
- The semantics of the preposition get incorporated into the verbal semantics and the corresponding argument or adjunct becomes semantically prominent
Other Voices

- E.g. *-an, starts functioning as a preverb and incorporates its semantics into the verb

  \[
  \text{VERB } \text{en-DIR.OBJ} \quad \text{an-LOC} \quad (S)i-\text{INSTR} \quad \text{SUBJ}
  \]
Other Voices

- E.g. *-an, starts functioning as a preverb and incorporates its semantics into the verb

```
VERB  en-DIR.OBJ  an-LOC  (S)i-INSTR  SUBJ

VERB-an  en-DIR.OBJ  LOC  (S)i-INSTR  SUBJ
```
Other Voices

- E.g. *-an, starts functioning as a preverb and incorporates its semantics into the verb

```
VERB   en-DIR.OBJ   an-LOC   (S)i-INSTR   SUBJ
```

```
VERB-*an   en-DIR.OBJ   LOC   (S)i-INSTR   SUBJ
```
Other Voices

- E.g. *-an, starts functioning as a preverb and incorporates its semantics into the verb

\[
\text{VERB} \quad \text{en-DIR.OBJ} \quad \text{an-LOC} \quad (S)i-\text{INSTR} \quad \text{SUBJ}
\]

\[
\text{VERB-} an \quad \text{en-DIR.OBJ} \quad \text{LOC} \quad (S)i-\text{INSTR} \quad \text{SUBJ}
\]
Other Voices

Instances of **prepositions or adverbs becoming preverbs/applicatives** are very common: Kinyarwanda (from Peterson 1997)

(7)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>úmwáana y-a-taa-ye</th>
<th>igitabo mú máazi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child</td>
<td>HE-PST-throw-ASP book in water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The child has thrown the book into the water.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>úmwáana y-a-taa-ye-mo</td>
<td>igitabo mú máazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child</td>
<td>HE-PST-throw-ASP-APP book water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The child has thrown the book into the water.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Voices

Instances of **prepositions or adverbs becoming preverbs/applicatives** are very common: Kinyarwanda (from Peterson 1997)

(7)  

a. Úmwáana y-a-taa-ye  
    
    igitabo mú máazi  
    
    child  
    
    HE-PST-throw-ASP book  
    
    in  
    
    water  
    
    ‘The child has thrown the book into the water.’

b. Úmwáana y-a-taa-ye-mo 
    
    igitabo mú máazi 
    
    child  
    
    HE-PST-throw-ASP-APP book  
    
    water 
    
    ‘The child has thrown the book into the water.’
Other Voices

- Adpositions/adverbs **next to DP**, preverbs on **verb**
- Vedic and Classical Sanskrit (data from Kulikov 2012:725)

(8)  

a. \( \text{indava} \text{ḥ á} \text{gmann ō} \text{tásya yónim ā} \)  
drops came of.order lap-ACC to  
“The drops have come upon the lap of the order.”

b. \( \text{á yónim} \text{ványam asadat} \)  
to lap-ACC wooden-ACC sat.down  
“He sat down upon the wooden lap.”

- Another parallel: Tondano and Saisiyat
Other Voices

- Adpositions/adverbs *next to DP*, preverbs on *verb*
- Vedic and Classical Sanskrit (data from Kulikov 2012:725)

(8) a. \( \text{indavah} \ \text{agmann} \ \text{rtasya} \ \text{yonim} \ \text{a} \)
drops came of.order lap-ACC to
“The drops have come upon the lap of the order.”

b. \( \text{a} \ \text{yonim} \ \text{vanyam} \ \text{asadat} \)
to lap-ACC wooden-ACC sat.down
“He sat down upon the wooden lap.”

- Another parallel: Tondano and Saisiyat
Tondano and Saisiyat

- DPs marked for active voice, object, instrument, and referent (Blust 2013:445)
- **Unmarked** when promoted to focus (or subject) position

(9) a. *si tuama k-um-eoŋ roda wo tali waki pasar*
   TOP man AV-will.pull card with rope to market
   “The man will pull the cart with the rope to the market.”

b. *tali i-keoŋ ni tuama roda waki pasar*
   rope IV-will.pull ACT man cart to market
   “The man will pull the cart with the rope to the market.”

(10) a. *korkoring k-om-i-kita’ ka ’aehoe’*
    child AV-RED-look.at ACC dog
    “The child was looking at the dog.”
Tondano and Saisiyat

- DPs marked for active voice, object, instrument, and referent (Blust 2013:445)
- **Unmarked** when promoted to focus (or subject) position

(9)  
\[ \text{a. si tuama k-um-eoŋ roda wo tali waki pasar} \]
TOP man AV-will.pull card with rope to market
“The man will pull the cart with the rope to the market.”

\[ \text{b. tali i-keoŋ ni tuama roda waki pasar} \]
rope IV-will.pull ACT man cart to market
“The man will pull the cart with the rope to the market.”

(10)  
\[ \text{a. korkoring k-om-i-kita’ ka ’aehoe’} \]
child AV-RED-look.at ACC dog
“The child was looking at the dog.”
Why Subject?

- How do we get to the voice system?
Why Subject?

- How do we get to the **voice system**?
- “Promotion” to subjects: **reanalysis**
Why Subject?

VERB  en-DIR.OBJ  an-LOC  SUBJ
Why Subject?

VERB    \textit{en}-\textsc{dir.obj} \textit{an}-\textsc{loc} \textsc{subj}

VERB-\textit{an} \textit{en}-\textsc{dir.obj} \textsc{loc} \textsc{subj}
Why Subject?

VERB \textit{en}-DIR.OBJ \textit{an}-LOC SUBJ

VERB-\textit{an} \textit{en}-DIR.OBJ LOC SUBJ
Why Subject?

VERB \textit{en-DIR.OBJ} \textit{an-LOC} SUBJ

VERB-\textit{an} \textit{en-DIR.OBJ} LOC SUBJ
The only two unmarked arguments now are the subject and the argument previously governed by the raised preposition.
Why Subject?

VERB en-DIR.OBJ an-LOC SUBJ

VERB-an en-DIR.OBJ LOC SUBJ

- The only two unmarked arguments now are the subject and the argument previously governed by the raised preposition
- Pro-drop
- Independent evidence for both pro-drop and null marking of nominatives in PAN
Why Subject?

The only two unmarked arguments now are the subject and the argument previously governed by the raised preposition

- Pro-drop
- Independent evidence for both pro-drop and null marking of nominatives in PAN
Why Subject?

The only two unmarked arguments now are the subject and the argument previously governed by the raised preposition

- Pro-drop

- Independent evidence for both pro-drop and null marking of nominatives in PAN

**Reanalysis**
Why Subject?

The only two unmarked arguments now are the subject and the argument previously governed by the raised preposition.

- Pro-drop
- Independent evidence for both pro-drop and null marking of nominatives in PAN
- Reanalysis $\rightarrow$ voice system
Recap

- The new proposal
  - Unifies promotion to subject and semantic prominence
  - Captures the asymmetry: nominalization vs. non-nominalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflexive</td>
<td>infix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Captures all functions of the affixes
- Subject-only restriction: restriction on extraction from PP
- Puts forth an explanation for how a peculiar and typologically unusual system results from well-attested morphosyntactic stages and reanalysis
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**Synchonic analysis**

- Head-movement of P to V

```
vP
   /\ 
  /   \  
DP   v'  
     /    
  SUBJECT v  
   / \   /  
  v   VP VPP
      /   
     P   DP
        an LOCATION
```

Gašper Beguš

*Harvard University — begus@fas.harvard.edu*

**Voice system of Austronesian and its origins**
Synchonic analysis

- Predicts that preverbs will follow verbal head
- Predicts that in Vedic (head-final) preverbs will precede

(11)

```
(11) vP
   /       \
  v'       v
     /\     /\    \
    PP  VP  DP
   /\   /\   /\   /\   /\   /\   /\
  LOCATION  V  DP  P  SUBJECT
```

Gašper Beguš

Voice system of Austronesian and its origins

Harvard University — begus@fas.harvard.edu
Applicatives

- This stage when agent is the subject
- After *reanalysis* the system developed from a system with prepositions/preverb into a system of applicative heads
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Conclusion

- A new explanation for the origins and development of the voice system in Austronesian.
- Typologically highly unusual morphosyntactic system finds quite typical origins
- Transitive-marking system and a series of prepositions, reanalysis
Advantages

- Derives the two functions: nominalization, voice marking
- Accounts for asymmetries between the active voice and other voices in the paradigm
- Unifies promotion to subject and semantic prominence
- Subject-only restriction
- Several later developments are easily explained under my approach
Conclusion

- Show how a historical analysis offers insight into synchronic syntactic structure
- Internal reconstruction works for typologically unusual systems too: grammaticalization theory
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